



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tax is not a tax upon the property passing by will, but a tax upon the right to succeed to the property. This right is created by state law, and may be made to contribute to the support of the state quite regardless of the nature of the property which passes. In the second case (*Murdoch vs. Ward*, No. 458) this decision is applied to the federal inheritance tax. "If a state inheritance law," says the opinion; "can validly impose a tax measured by the amount or value of the legacy, even if that amount includes United States bonds, the reasoning that justified such a conclusion must, when applied to the case of a Federal inheritance law taxing the very same legacy, bring us to the same conclusion."

WESLEY C. MITCHELL.

A CRITIC OF ANTHROPO-SOCIOLOGY.

IN the February number of the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* Mr. John Cummings has a strenuous criticism of the work of the group of anthropologists who have ventured, "gratuitously and somewhat ostentatiously," to intrude into the sacred precincts of sociology. Their data and interpretations are consigned "to the same limbo" as astrology, phrenology, and palmistry, with the happy result that "the world of sociologists"—which has been, it seems, "somewhat aghast for the time being"—is "composing itself once more," and "sociology may breathe again naturally."

If a voice might return from the aforesaid limbo, at the risk of disturbing again the peaceful (and perhaps at times audible) breathing of sociology, it might inquire why a sociologist should regard the discovery or assertion of the sociological significance of anthropological data as so distressing. Is sociology conceived as already in the calm eventide of her existence, when having accomplished her work and achieved the position of a complete and rounded science, she may confidently the drowsy curtain of her eyelids draw against any body of pertinent data offered by economics, history, biology, or anthropology? It would seem that such a body of data ought to be regarded as a contribution rather than as a gratuitously disturbing element. There is, rightly considered, no such spirit of antagonism as our author seems to imagine. It is true that "anthropology has been destined by anthropologists"—perhaps a little rashly—"to revolutionize the political and social sciences as radically as bacteriology has revolutionized the science of medicine." Taking the prophecy as it stands, it may be noted that no hostility exists between bacteriology

and the science of medicine which it has revolutionized, and that sociology, which admittedly must be built up largely on the results of subsidiary sciences, need not take it amiss if the progress of any of these compels radical change. But it must be admitted on the part of the anthropologists that their phraseology, as quoted by Mr. Cummings, is a little too much colored by the first enthusiasm of discovery. Still the expression is hardly too strong as regards what must be the ultimate effect of the discoveries of anthropo-sociology, always with the proviso that the generalizations already reached are confirmed by further investigation.

It is this further investigation which the pioneers have sought — to speak somewhat irreverently — to stir up on the part of individuals or institutions that have the means and prestige to prosecute the researches on a more adequate scale. "If (to quote the first English exposition of the matter) their tone appears somewhat too dogmatic, this is partly because it has seemed best to state the results briefly and positively and in a way that may possibly promote the collection of data which will tend either to confirm or to refute the deductions drawn from those here represented.¹ While the economist and the worker in many branches of social science can draw without labor and without price upon a vast mass of official statistics, the anthropo-sociologists have had to collect their own data by the slow process of measuring individuals and by the vastly slower process of persuading them one by one to allow themselves to be measured. They have deemed themselves fortunate when they could secure the mere consent of the government to measure army conscripts, and this often under conditions that make the work difficult and unsatisfactory."² Under these

¹ *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, January 1896, p. 184.

² "The official inspectors must not be retarded in their work as the Ministry of War attaches that condition to permission to view the recruits. Many of those rejected for service are dismissed by the surgeons at a glance, but I must make measurements on all alike. They are sent to my room at the rate of two hundred in three hours, sometimes two hundred and forty; and on all these men I must make many measurements, while rendering instant decision upon the color of the hair and eyes. The mental effort involved in forming so many separate judgments in such quick succession often brings me near fainting at the close of the session."—Otto Ammon.

"Each time I have required the consent of an official, the head of an institution, or a prefect, the favor has been granted grudgingly if not refused altogether. Many investigations have thus been prevented by mere caprice or by the fear of displeasing someone in authority. Others have been broken off when almost complete and an immense amount of work has been thereby rendered useless." Lapouge, *l'Aryen* (Paris 1899), p. 448.

conditions Lapouge has measured some 12,000 subjects and Ammon 22,962, subsequently analyzing from various points of view the data thus obtained. Some idea of the labor involved may be formed from the fact that the mere presentation and exposition of Ammon's material and results, with very little discussion of its significance, requires over seven hundred large octavo pages. The results reached by Ammon and Lapouge have been confirmed by the independent researches of a few other investigators and have been formulated in certain generalizations, or, more briefly, "laws," which if correct are of obvious sociological importance. With the co-operation of scientific societies and especially of the sociological departments of the universities, the truth or falsity of these laws could be definitely established. For example, if measurements were taken of the students of French and of German origin in the American universities, we should have an excellent test of the theory that migrants from these countries to America are composed more largely of the dolichocephalic element than are the home populations from which they come. Under these conditions the anthropologists may perhaps be excused for insisting somewhat strongly upon the sociological significance of their investigations.

It need hardly be said that Mr. Cummings's paper is one of great interest, and that the anthropo-sociologists should welcome it gladly, for just such candid criticism is certainly a help toward clearing up difficulties and inconsistencies in the exposition and interpretation of their data. Such inconsistencies as exist have indeed been perceived and elaborated with great astuteness. But the admitted existence of such difficulties does not appear at all to justify the condemnation of the whole science, for no science which deals with the complicated data of human experience is free from them. By the same method of attack, history or economics, not to mention sociology, could be thrown out into the outer darkness where there is the wailing of astrology and palmistry and the gnashing of Coin's Financial School.¹ If political

¹Without wishing to conceal whatever family skeletons may exist in the closet of anthropo-sociology, I am constrained to dispute the tie of relationship which Mr. Cummings implies in designating our science as "racial phrenology" (p. 211). Anthropology and phrenology both attach significance to the form of the human skull; monetary science and the vagaries of the professional free silver cranks both attach significance to the weight of the silver dollar. There is no real tie of relationship in the first case, any more than in the second. While for the phrenologist the bumps are an alleged direct indication of individual qualities, the form of the head is for the anthropologist evidence of race and so in general of certain racial qualities.

economy has not succeeded in the hundred odd years of its existence as a science in becoming entirely reconciled with itself, it is not to be wondered at that anthropo-sociology has not in the ten years in which its data have been accumulating solved all the difficulties in their interpretation. All that can be expected is that it should seek to explain as consistently as may be all the available data, add to the stock as rapidly as its resources permit, and modify its hypotheses as the new material may require. Its "laws" are not logical principles which must hold without exception, but merely generalizations from empirical data. The immediate service of the preliminary generalizations is to indicate in what direction further investigation should be directed.

While Mr. Cummings's criticisms suggest certain changes in exposition, they do not I think present any valid refutation of the essential results of anthropo-sociology. One or two of his arguments appear to be merely the result of a misleading use of formal logic. Others rest on bare assertion or opinion without proof. Others spring from a misapprehension of the statements and conceptions of the authors criticized. In part this misapprehension is, I venture to think, of our author's own manufacture; but in part it takes its origin in faults of exposition on the part of the anthropo-sociologists, more especially in the necessarily curtailed accounts of the subject where in order to save space for the exposition of new or special data, it has been necessary to condense the more general aspects of the matter into a somewhat crude and dogmatic statement, with too little attention to exceptions and qualifications and without a sufficiently frequent repetition from article to article of necessary cautions and modifications. This fault cannot be urged against the more detailed expositions in the principal works devoted to the subject: Ammon's *Die Natürliche Auslese beim Menschen* (1893) and *Anthropologie der Badener* (1899), and Lapouge's *Les Selections sociales* (1896) and *l'Aryen* (1899). These works contain indeed taken together a full statement and discussion of practically all of the difficulties upon which Mr. Cummings bases his criticism. But in view of the wrong impression apparently conveyed by some of the shorter articles, I am glad to take this occasion to supplement and in certain respects to correct these cruder expositions of anthropological doctrine. This restatement will incidentally touch upon some of Mr. Cummings's objections. His other arguments can then be considered separately.

I will consider first the matter in which apparently the greatest misapprehension exists, namely, the question of the association of certain traits in individuals. Much of our author's argument seems to rest on the assumption that the anthropologists regard certain traits as constantly and uniformly found in association. Here and there this assumption crops out into definite statement, as when, for example, we are told (p. 96) that the laws of anthropo-sociology "depend upon an *absolute fixity* in relationship between *individual* variation of character and *individual* index." The assumption as thus expressed and as more often tacitly implied colors the whole course of the argument. It is wholly the result of misapprehension of the anthropological doctrine. If the anthropologists held this conception, their case would certainly be a weak one, for their own statistics show clearly that there is no such invariable relation between physical and psychical traits. All that is asserted is a certain tendency toward such association, which tendency will appear if a sufficient number of individuals are brought under observation. For example, the best-attested law of anthropo-sociology is that in populations such as those of France and Germany the more dolichocephalic elements tend to concentrate in the urban centers. This is apparently because the dolichocephalic elements are somewhat more restless or ambitious than the brachycephalic elements. This again is apparently because in the present mixed population the elements into which the old Nordic or Teutonic stock has entered most largely tend to reproduce in combination both its dolichocephaly and its active temperament. But this does not mean at all that every dolichocephalic is more active or migratory than every brachycephalic, any more than the general statement that men are taller than women means that Mr. Smith is necessarily taller than Mrs. Smith. Both the migratory and the sedentary elements of the population will of course consist of dolichocephalic, brachycephalic, and intermediate individuals; but there will be a slight preponderance of dolichocephaly in the migratory group. This is all the fixity of association that could be expected, especially where the population is so thoroughly mixed as in central Europe, and this is all that has been held by the anthropologists to exist. In fact, it is probable that the rule will be found subject to exceptions even where considerable groups are taken in each category; and it is possible even that in certain populations the association between a restless temperament and dolichocephaly may be found to have wholly disappeared as a consequence of long and complete interbreeding.

This by the way, explains in part why the variation in index between the different sociological groups is often so slight as it is actually found to be. What may be called the normal association between index and temperament holds apparently among a majority of the subjects in each category, but the absence of association among others partly neutralizes the effect of the normal cases. Hence the objection sometimes urged that the difference in average index between the sociological categories is usually slight loses its force. Nothing but a slight variation could be expected.

Evidently there is no convincing *a priori* reason why, in the admittedly complex composition of the populations of Europe, correlations between cephalic index and psychic traits should have persisted even in this general sense. If the correlation were asserted simply on theoretical grounds, there would indeed be the probability in its favor that the distinctive mental traits of the Nordic race might be expected to appear more often than otherwise among those of the present population who most nearly reproduce the physical traits and especially the characteristic head form of that race. But the assertion does not rest upon this theoretic probability but upon empirical data gathered without a suspicion that they would yield such a result. When Ammon in making a purely geographical study of the population of Baden, discovered that the urban residents and migrants were more dolichocephalic than the peasantry, no other explanation could be found than that of some correlation between dolichocephaly and the restless spirit that seeks the opportunities of city life. It may be added that no other adequate explanation has yet been offered. Thus the theory grew necessarily from the empirical data, and in fact the so-called laws of anthropo-sociology are only summary statements of the results of such statistics as have been gathered regarding the correlation between psychological and physical characteristics. That there is such a correlation appears to be the only reasonable conclusion from the wide range of anthropological data which have become available, unless indeed the anthropologists have concocted or doctored their statistics, or unless they have been the victims of a most extraordinary series of coincidences all pointing in one direction. Yet Mr. Cummings adopts no one of these alternative explanations, nor does he suggest any of his own. He simply ignores the data and dismisses the whole matter with the opinion that there are "no very good grounds" for accepting "the cephalic index as an index of character" (p. 197-198), and with the

assertion that "the physical earmarks of race have gone one way while the mental attributes of race have gone another" (p. 211). What weight have such expressions of *a priori* opinion against the results of empirical data?

Our critic apparently reaches his conclusion that mental and physical traits have wholly parted company, as in indirect result of the admitted complexity and irregularity of the association in individuals of the physical traits themselves. But in the one case as in the other the question whether there are regular tendencies toward association is one which must be decided from actual data. Even if there were no tendency for association say between tall stature and dolichocephaly, it would not follow that there would be none between dolichocephaly and an active temperament. The available data go to show that this latter tendency toward association exists at least in the various groups of population studied in France and Germany.¹ Mr. Cummings might legitimately argue that the data are insufficient to prove the proposition; but they certainly create a strong presumption in its favor which can only be neutralized by actual evidence on the other side. Mr. Cummings apparently has no such evidence to offer.

This brings us indirectly to the question of the racial composition of the population of Europe. The passage in which our author attacks the conception of race and the analysis of European populations into three or four principal or primary races (pp. 185-194) is apparently the most effective portion of his whole criticism. Its apparent effectiveness comes mainly from two misconceptions. The first is an exaggerated idea of the extent to which the different race types have become lost by interbreeding. The complexity in which the different traits are combined in the existing population is undoubtedly great, but it is not so absolute as Mr. Cummings supposes. The second misapprehension is the assumption that the theory of anthropo-sociology is inconsistent with the complexity of combination that actually exists, that in other

¹Since the above was in type an important confirmation of the generality of the law has come to hand in the researches of Dr. Andreas M. Hansen in Scandinavia. His *Norsk Folkepsykologi med politisk Kart over Skandinavien* (Kristiania, 1889), shows that the dolichocephalic population groups are distinctly more advanced economically, more progressive politically, and in general more active than the more brachycephalic groups. His conclusions are summarized by Ammon in the *Centralblatt für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, Heft 3, 1900. Some evidence also exists with reference to Switzerland, North Italy, Austria, Russia, and lastly with reference to emigrants from Europe to America.

words the anthropo-sociologists presuppose that the principal races enter without much fusion or confusion, each in relatively pure form, into the existing populations, and that the distinctive race traits appear in uniform combinations.

Both these misapprehensions may be met by a summary restatement of the actual teaching of the anthropo-sociologists. In the first place it should be pointed out that the use of the word race and the corresponding conception is not essential to their theory. If the reader so prefers, he may follow Ammon¹ in the use of the more non-committal word type rather than Lapouge in the use of the term race. No race can, of course, be regarded as pure,² but certain ones may be regarded as relatively, or in a sense as practically pure. A race may be distinguished by a combination of characteristics of general prevalence among its members and capable of being transmitted to the great majority of their descendants.³

The population of Europe as a whole is extremely mixed, the various physical traits combining in the different population groups in various seemingly irregular ways. The apparent confusion has led some anthropologists to abandon altogether the attempt at racial analysis of that population, and has even brought some of them to regard race as a purely ideal conception. The difficulty can be met by distinguishing between the tolerably pure representatives of the principal races and the great mass of intermediate types who represent no pure race but only a confused mixture.⁴

The determination of the three or four principal primary races of Europe is reached partly by the study of the present population, and partly by the records of the past, literary descriptions, and crania. The principal evidence, briefly stated, is as follows:

The north of Europe is characterized today by the prevalence of blondness, tall stature and dolichocephaly. The data tend to show, further, that these traits are in that region more commonly than otherwise associated in the same individuals, that is, for example, that tall persons are more generally dolichocephalic and of lighter pigmentation

¹ "Die Frage, ob die verschiedenen Gruppen von Menschen wirklich gesonderte Rassen sind, können wir auf sich beruhen lassen; Typen sind sie jedenfalls." *Anthropologie der Badener*, p. 106.

² AMMON, *Natürliche Auslese beim Menschen*, p. 1.

LAPOUGE, *Les sélections sociales*, p. 3.

³ *Les sélections sociales*, p. 7

⁴ *Ibid.*

than short persons. The evidence of the skeletons is that the ancient inhabitants of this region were dolichocephalic and relatively tall; the evidence of all literary records is that they were tall and of light pigmentation. Lastly, there is the consideration that the climatic conditions of the region in question have been such as would produce a blond, lymphatic race by the process of climatic selection. We have, then, the evidence of the existence in the north of a tall, blondish, dolichocephalic type. If one grants that individuals of this type are by intermarriage with similar individuals capable of transmitting their distinctive traits to the great majority of their descendants — with more or less allowance, of course, for individual variation, for atavism, etc. — one is justified in regarding them as a race. This race, or type, is variously designated by the terms “Nordic,” “Aryan,” *Homo Europæus*.

By similar reasoning another great race may be distinguished, also dolichocephalic, but prevailing dark and short, centered mainly in Spain and southern Italy, and designated usually as the Mediterranean type.

The population of central Europe tends in varying degrees toward brachycephaly. This phenomenon is ordinarily attributed to the presence and intermixture in varying proportion of one or more races of brachycephalics, intermediate in pigmentation and stature between the Nordic and the Mediterranean races, and designated as the Alpine type, *Homo Alpinus*. According to one view this race has come from the great center of brachycephaly in Asia.¹ According to another it has developed on the ground by a process of natural or social selection.²

From the foregoing it will be seen that the anthropologists do not by any means consider European populations as composed exclusively of the above three races, nor do they imagine that a very large proportion of the population, especially in the central region, represents any one of the types in its pure form. Lapouge estimates roughly, as follows, the number of individuals of the race *Homo Europæus*, that is to say, those combining relative dolichocephaly, tall stature and light pigmentation, and capable, probably, of transmitting such traits to most of their children: In the United States, 15 millions; in the British Isles, 10 millions; in Russia, 9 millions; in Germany, 6 millions; in

¹ RIPLEY, *Races of Europe*, p. 473; AMMON, *Anthropologie der Badener*, p. 105.

² LAPOUGE, *L'Aryen*, pp. 227-235.

Scandinavia, 2.3 millions; in Austria, 1.8 millions; in France, 1.6 millions; in Spanish America, 1.5 millions; in the British colonies, one million; in Holland, 600,000; in Italy, 500,000; in Switzerland, 100,000; in Spain, 100,000; in the rest of the world, 100,000.¹ The number of brachycephalics of relatively pure race in Europe may be put, possibly, at 50 million.² "The great majority then of the populations of central Europe are composed of crosses of all degrees" between *Homo Europæus* and the brachycephalics.³ The irregular combinations of physical traits are admittedly often as numerous as, sometimes more numerous than, the regular combinations. This is partly because the tendency toward the normal combinations is weakened where the intermixture of races has been of early and general occurrence. Another explanation, brought out especially in Professor Ripley's recent work, is that differences in environment and nutrition have so modified stature and perhaps also pigmentation as to overbalance in certain regions the tendency toward the normal combinations. Again, it is possible that the data as to the distribution and association of the different traits may be found to accord better with the hypothesis of four or more races or types instead of three. If, with Deniker and Lapouge, we adopt the recent distinction between two brachycephalic types, one dark and short, constituting the principal element in France, the other relatively tall and (in some combinations) blond, entering largely into the population of Austria, northern Italy, south and east Germany,⁴ we may find a solution of many of the apparent inconsistencies in the data for central Europe.

The above is an exposition of the present status of the theory of the ethnic composition of the population of Europe as provisionally held by the anthropo-sociologists, with some merging or compromising of individual differences. I have devoted so much space to the matter rather to correct misapprehensions that may have arisen from previous briefer statements of the theory, than because of its intrinsic importance for anthropo-sociology. It is in fact rather the concern of descriptive anthropology than of the sociological branch of the science. Granted the existence of the Nordic race type, and the theory of anthropo-sociology remains practically undisturbed, whatever changes and refinements may be necessitated in the determination of the brachycephalic and Mediterranean types, and so in the analysis of the

¹ *L'Aryen*, pp. 345-346.

² LAPOUGE, *les sélections sociales*, p. 20.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. JOURNAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, December 1899, pp. 68, 69.

actual population. In fact it is not necessary to grant even that premise, for so long as the accumulating data continue to show a correlation between head-form and mental tendency, we have, independently of any racial interpretation whatever, the basis for the study of the working of social selection as between the dolichocephalic and brachycephalic elements in the population.

It will have been noticed that in the foregoing discussion the cephalic index has been assumed to be both the best single test of race and an indication of psychological tendency. According to Mr. Cummings this double use of the index is wholly unjustifiable and self-destructive. "The cephalic index," he tells us, "may be an index either of ethnic generation or of social selection. It cannot be both. If it is an index of individual capacity and fitness to survive, it cannot be accepted as an index of ethnic generation; and if it is accepted as an index of ethnic generation, it cannot be accepted as an index of individual fitness to survive" (p. 197). This argument is, I think, based on a misleading use of formal logic. If, as tacitly assumed, race and capacity were wholly independent, the cephalic index could not be used as an index of both. But, as the two run parallel, what is an index of one is also an index of the other. The fallacy of Mr. Cummings's argument may best be shown by an illustration. If speaking of the negro as contrasted with the white, he were to affirm: "The color of the skin may be either an indication of race or an indication of ability; it cannot be both," we should at once see the futility of the reasoning. Granted that the negro is, as a race, or if you please, on the average, less capable than the white, the color of his skin, just because it is an indication of his race, is *for that very reason* an indication of his inferiority. In a similar sense a low cephalic index in western Central Europe is an indication of race, or at least of racial affinity, and for that very reason it is an indication of psychological tendency, and so indirectly of relative fitness to survive.

There is, therefore, no inconsistency in Lapouge's use of the cephalic index at once as a basis for distinguishing between the different racial elements and as an indication of temperament, since the temperament being an internal and the index an external manifestation of race, they will tend to appear in a constant relation. It is true that the proportion of dolichocephalic and of brachycephalic elements is regarded as changing through a process of natural or social selection. Thus the anthropo-sociologists have explained the increase of the

brachycephalic type in Europe, on the theory that the dolichocephalics wear themselves out in warfare,¹ in the stress of urban life, and in all kinds of ambitious undertakings, leaving the brachycephalics to multiply under the more normal conditions of rural life. As already noted in another connection, Lapouge is even inclined to trace the origin and spread of the brachycephalics in Europe to a similar selective process. But here again the index may consistently be used both as an index of race and as an index of survival, just because the survival in question is a racial survival, that is, because the selection works along racial lines. In a word, the brachycephalics multiply more freely, not because of their brachycephaly, but because of their greater fitness to survive. This fitness to survive depends on psychological traits which are associated with their race, it depends therefore, so to speak, upon their racial make. Brachycephaly is merely the trade-mark of that racial make by which it may be most clearly recognized.

If the criticism just considered rests upon a misleading use of logic, the next objection advanced by our author seems to be due to an oversight of one large side of anthropological doctrine. "Anthropology tries," we are told (pp. 199, 201), "to eliminate all environmental influences which may have modified the physical types of population." As far as I can judge from the context, this rather surprising statement should read somewhat as follows: "Professor Ripley (in attempting to interpret the complex actual combination of traits in conformity with his theory of three principal races) tries to eliminate *for the moment* all environmental influences which may have modified stature or pigmentation in such a way as to overbalance or obscure the hereditary or racial tendencies that would otherwise be apparent." If the sentence and the accompanying argument is to be thus interpreted, I need not discuss it here. But as the objection at least appears, as it stands, to be urged against "the philosophy of modern anthropology" in general, I must point out that anthropology, so far from attempting to eliminate environmental influences, attributes all human differences ultimately to such influences working either directly upon the present generation or through a selective process. Racial differences are conceived as the result of selection under different environments, and I know of no such elaborate study of the effects of environment on man

¹As the most recent bit of evidence of the penchant of this race for military activity may be cited from A. M. Hansen's *Norsk Folkepsykologi* the fact that in Norway the membership of the voluntary clubs for practice in marksmanship is three times as numerous in the dolichocephalic as in the more brachycephalic population groups.

as that of Lapouge in connection with the origin and development of the race *Europaecus*¹ But the racial character once acquired has a certain tendency to persist and assert itself under changed conditions. Race becomes, so to speak, a reservoir of the past effects of environment. The question between race and environment is mainly a question of time.

It is a pleasure to be able to find much with which to agree in the sketch that Mr. Cummings gives of the theoretical origin of ethnic character, through selection and socialization under conditions of more or less isolation (pp. 202-206). But I cannot agree that "the real process of ethnic generation," as he describes it, "bears no resemblance to the process elaborated in modern anthropology" (p. 207). It appears to me rather that Lapouge's theory of the origin of the race *Europaecus* through natural and especially climatic selection, and in comparative isolation, may be regarded as an elaboration of Mr. Cummings' more general theory. The principal ground of disagreement is that whereas Lapouge regards the distinctive mental qualities of the race as still associated in some degree with its distinctive physical traits, Mr. Cummings insists that no such correlation can have survived the complex interbreeding that has gone on (p. 207). We are thus brought back to the point from which we started, and again our answer must be that the tendency toward such association of traits is asserted only as the necessary result of empirical data. Mr. Cummings again in this connection shows a disposition to meet such evidence by mere assertion. "The economic standard of worth," which is becoming more and more the standard that counts, "does not," he tells us, "recognize the ethnic factor" (p. 210); and again, "a glance at the composition of any of our social groups, from the urban slum population upwards, shows that the ethnical cleavage runs vertically through them all, and demonstrates the deceptive character of any idea such as that implied in the term 'ethnic stratification' or horizontal cleavage" (p. 210). Surely the anthropologists have never meant to imply that the ethnic composition of population is precisely parallel with its social composition. The ethnical cleavage is not pretended to be horizontal or exactly coincident with the social cleavage, but the data go to show that neither is it, as Mr. Cummings holds, merely vertical. It is rather oblique, with a tendency toward parallelism with the lines of social and also of economic demarcation. No one of these cleavages, social,

¹ *L'Aryen*, pp. 47-186, 350-365.

economic, or ethnical, is precisely parallel with the others; the racial line is related to either of the others somewhat as they are related between themselves. The upper social and economic categories; the urban residents, as contrasted with the peasants; the skilled laborers, the business and professional classes, as contrasted with the masses, contain a larger and larger proportion of dolichocephalic elements. Wealth is most abundant, industry, commerce, and discovery are most active in the dolichocephalic portions of Europe, and the leading nations in the conduct of the world's affairs are today the nations into the composition of which the Nordic race has entered most freely. Thus the data go to show that the economic standard of worth is not indifferent to the ethnic factor.

CARLOS C. CLOSSON.

LOS ANGELES, CAL.

The Distribution of Wealth: A Theory of Wages, Interest and Profits, by Professor J. B. Clark, lately published by The Macmillan Company, has long been looked for with lively anticipation by students of economic theory. Earlier partial statements of Professor Clark's theoretical views, contained in monographs and in a great number of articles published in various periodicals, are here "brought into an orderly arrangement and extensively supplemented." The volume presents in a definitive form the results of Professor Clark's studies in the theory of distribution extending over the past twenty years. As the outcome of these studies, the preface states that "It is the purpose of this work to show that the distribution of the income of society is controlled by a natural law, and that this law, if it worked without friction, would give to every agent of production the amount of wealth which that agent creates."

THE specimen number of *The Russian Journal of Financial Statistics*, edited by Charles Goodlet, and published by G. Barbet de Vaux, appears in English from the St. Petersburg press of W. Kirshbaum. This announces that the second number will be issued about May 1, 1900, and that the regular quarterly numbers will begin in September. The new journal gives similar information to that contained in the French *Bulletin de Statistique et de Legislation Comparée*, but limited entirely to Russia. There is, however, an evident aim in the articles to correct what to the editor seems extreme ignorance of Russian